

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/675,748	Applicant(s) NOURI ET AL.	
	Examiner SUZANNE LO	Art Unit 2128	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SUZANNE LO. (3) Robert Lord.

(2) Mark McCarthy. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: McNamara, Hollander, Smith.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicants clarified that the invention is directed to comparison of test and golden results to debug the test simulator, not to debug a circuit design. The Examiner clarified the 103 rejection of claims 1-5,8,11,15,18-19,22,25,31-32,35,37-42 is made as unpatentable over McNamara in view of Hollander in further view of Smith (Patent '063).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.